

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are in the application. Claims 1-11, 17-31, 33-38, 41-43, and 48-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Wong (US Patent 6,700,891) in view of Sheikh et al. (US Patent 6,266,721). Claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Sheikh et al. and Jung et al. (US Patent 5,745,229). Claims 32, 39, 40, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Sheikh et al. and Fairchild et al. (US Patent 6,343,320). Claims 46 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Sheikh et al. and Zintel (US Patent 6,779,004).

With respect to the provisional rejection of claims 1-58 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-45, 47, 49-59, and 62 of co pending App. Ser. No. 09/746,519, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Particularly in view of the claims as amended herein, Applicant submits that the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn. The claims presented herein now specifically recite providing a physical, user-activated switch/button interface physically connected to the PLD system. This substantial distinction over the claims presented in App. Ser. No. 09/746,519 are submitted to render the claims patentably distinct, and accordingly it is requested that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn. If there are any questions regarding this issue, Applicant's attorney requests an opportunity to discuss such matters with the Examiner by telephone.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejections in view of Wong in combination with Sheikh, Jung, Fairchild, and/or Zintel. In an effort to expedite prosecution, however, Applicant has amended the independent claims to further emphasize certain distinguishing attributes of the present invention over the cited art. In particular, the currently pending claims now recite a user-activated switch/button interface physically connected to the filtering system that selectively filters packets or blocks packet transmission in response to user activation. Support for these amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in Figures 9 and 10 and the accompanying description, such as on pages 28-31.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 4, the Examiner identified the Sheikh reference as teaching “the use of push buttons for control”, and has indicated that one would be motivated to combine the Sheikh reference with the Wong reference because “it allows for a simple and easy way to activate the filtering or blocking of packets”. The Examiner has identified a portion of the Sheikh reference that describes a ‘fly-by-wire’ physical control means:

“a means is provided by which all indicators, push buttons and other physical control means are actuated via the multiple node service processor network. No indicators, push buttons or other physical control means are physically connected to the device which they control, but are connected to a microcontroller, which then actuates the control or provides the information being monitored.” (Sheikh et al., col. 18: 37-43)

As the express teachings of Sheikh make clear, Sheikh discloses a physical control means that is not physically connected to the device it controls. In fact, Sheikh’s discussion of the ‘fly-by-wire’ concept is submitted to teach away from Applicant’s physical, user-activated switch/button interface physically connected to the PLD system, as these control mechanisms are distinctly different. Accordingly, if one were to combine the Wong reference with the Sheikh reference, Applicant submits that the result would be a teaching to use a ‘fly-by-wire’ physical control means that is not physically connected to the device it controls, but is connected via a multiple node service processor network.

Applicant submits that, particularly in light of the clarifying amendments herein, Applicant’s claimed invention is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and the prior art rejections should be withdrawn. Applicant submits that, for at least these reasons, all claims should be allowable. If there are any questions regarding this issue, Applicant’s attorney requests an opportunity to discuss such matters with the Examiner by telephone.

Finally, Applicant notes that it is still reviewing whether or not Wong is in fact prior art to Applicant’s invention. While Applicant does not admit that Wong is in fact prior art to Applicant’s invention, and Applicant may demonstrate in the future that Applicant’s invention predates Wong, Applicant has chosen herein to emphasize the clear distinction of the claimed invention over the cited combination of references.

Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Please charge any additional fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit
Account No. 50-0251.

No new matter has been added.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan R. Loudermilk
Registration No. 32,788
Attorney for Applicant(s)

July 22, 2006
Loudermilk & Associates
P.O. Box 3607
Los Altos, CA 94024-0607
408-868-1516